UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

The Book of the New Reformation

By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

The World Significance of Mahatma Gandhi

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Calvary

A Poem by JOHN ROTHSCHILD

VOLUME LXXXIX NUMBER 6

Chicago, April 6, 1922

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 83
The Book of the New Reformation.—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 85
The Four-Power Alliance.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 87

ARTICLES—

The World Significance of Mahatma Gandhi.—*John Haynes Holmes* 88
UNITY Fellowship Associates 94

POETRY—

Calvary.—JOHN ROTHSCHILD 83
Bereavement.—*D. A.* 93
The Ships of Hope.—JAMES WALDO FAWCETT 93

THE FIELD—

News from Hungary 95

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXIX. THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1922 NUMBER 6

CALVARY.

An invisible chorus chants in the winter heavens.

Acres of crosses—wooden crosses—bleak
as bones—and gray as sorrow.
. . . . . .
And some of them were crucified in
soul and body, and doubly died.
They who came dragging the cross of Hate.
They who came cursing to their Fate.

Who taught them to hate, who sent them to die?
'Twas you, ye women now shrunken with weeping!
'Twas you, ye men now broken and hoary,
who waved a flag and talked of glory!
When they went marching quick and bright,
When they went tramping off to fight—
and to kill
and to die.

And did you fear, ye stern-eyed men,
ye women knitting swollen-lidded?
Fear for the Spirit, and think that Force
would save the world from some great loss?
Why did ye wager with sin?
Could ye not trust the Spirit to win?

Acres of crosses—little crosses—row
on row—and gray as sorrow.
. . . . . .
When will you learn, ye folk of folly, how
wrath is weak, how patience is strong?
When will you learn the terrible power
of folded arms in the menacing hour?

JOHN ROTHSCHILD.

A good part of the present-day opposition to evolution would speedily melt away, if people could only be made to understand the distinction between evolution and Darwinism. The confusion of these two terms is very general; and inasmuch as the latter (Darwinism) is still much under discussion, it is naturally assumed that the former is also. As a matter of fact, of course, evolution is today established as a law of life. Its truth has been demonstrated by evidence, patiently and abundantly gathered by Charles Darwin and his successors, and is no more to be questioned than that of Newton's law of gravitation. Evolution is a *fact,* now permanently removed from the field of scientific controversy. Darwinism, on the other hand, is not a fact at all, but a *theory.* It is an attempt made by Darwin to explain the process of evolution which the facts he had gathered proved to be true. The hypothesis which he suggested was that of "natural selection"; and since this theory was original with Darwin, it became definitely associated with his name, as "Darwinism." Unlike his demonstration of the fact of evolution itself, however, Darwin's explanation of this fact has never been accepted by all scientists. Some have reverted to the Lamarckian theory of "adaptation"; others have adopted De Vries's doctrine of "mutations"; still others, such as Herbert Spencer, have been eclectic in their attitude, and thus recognized a variety of factors in the evolutionary process. All this has meant discussion, a problem unsettled, and in some cases a positive repudiation of "Darwinism," so-called—with the resultant belief on the part of the uninformed that evolution itself is still in question, or is even at last being rejected. Nothing, of course, could be farther from the truth. Nothing that happens to the Darwinian theory can affect in the slightest degree the fact of evolution. "Darwinism might be on its death-bed," says Professor Kellogg in his book, "Darwinism Today," "without shaking to any considerable degree the confidence of biologists and natural philosophers in the theory of descent (evolution)." If this fact could once be made clear, most of the present absurd discussion of the question would be promptly silenced.

Evolution, however, will never be accepted by some minds. Religious superstition, constitutional perversity, or sheer intellectual inability to recognize and assess the worth of evidence, must leave a remnant of the population unconvinced to the very end. Witness, for example, the book just published by Alfred W. McCann, called "God or Gorilla"! Mr. McCann is an educated and able man. For years he has rendered conspicuous public service as food expert on the staff of the New York *Globe.* His book shows that he has read widely and thoroughly in the literature of evolution. It shows, also, that his reading has meant no more to him than the mumbling of a Latin text to an illiterate school-boy. It is almost inconceivable that a man possessing Mr. McCann's degree of culture and training, can be so utterly blind to the significance of the data which he handles so cleverly. It makes one feel that there must be intellectual perverts in the world as well as moral perverts—men, that is, who are as incapable of recognizing the difference between reason and unreason as others are incapable of recognizing the difference between right and wrong. As a curiosity, Mr. McCann's volume is a masterpiece of the first order; nothing like it has come to our desk in years. But it is tragic to think of the number of people who will read it as an au-

thoritative scientific treatise, and use it as evidence that evolution is disproved. We are plainly in for a repetition of the old controversy which raged so fiercely in the first two decades following the publication of "The Origin of Species." It is a pity thus to be forced to spend good time and strength at such a task. But a generation has arisen that "knows not Joseph," and instruction must therefore begin anew.

We are deeply stirred to read that "admirers of Thoreau" have started a movement to preserve the crystal pond in the woods a mile and a half from Concord village, as a memorial to the immortal sage. Walden, we are told, is little changed since Thoreau built his hut on the spot now marked by a growing cairn of stones. The same woods stand about it, the same single railroad disturbs the stillness, and the straight lines of the "orchard" which he planted with pine cones can still be distinguished. As one of the most ardent "admirers of Thoreau," we commend this movement, and would be glad to do our part to make it succeed. But we wonder if our advocacy of the cause would not damage it beyond all repair! If we once got started, we would talk about Thoreau's philosophical anarchism. This would lead us to discussion of his doctrine of non-resistance. This would inevitably remind us of his conscientious objection to the Mexican War, and his jail sentence for refusing to pay taxes in this War. This would bring us without question to his great essay "On the Duty of Civil Disobedience," in which is taught the principle that refusal to obey the mandate of the State is oftentimes the highest duty of citizenship. By this time we can well imagine that most "admirers of Thoreau," whose admiration is probably in exact proportion to their ignorance of the soul of this great man, would be begging us to desist from giving aid to them in their good cause. This in turn would be embarrassing to us. So we think it wise to desist at the beginning instead of at the end or in the middle! We will help by keeping mum, and watching good 100% Americans, in this happy case, as they "know not what they do"!

Speaking of Thoreau, it is interesting to note that Gandhi, of India, traces his non-resistant ideals back to this great American as one of the original sources of his inspiration. This will undoubtedly be an important piece of information for the Boston Anglophiles who must be prominent among the "admirers" of the Concord seer who would preserve Walden as his memorial. It is the teachings of Thoreau, as well as of Tolstoy and the New Testament, which are now working havoc with British rule in India. When the history of nationalism in that far eastern country is written, it must have a chapter about Thoreau, and what he taught of non-resistance, and how his words, like seeds scattered by the sower, found soil and grew harvest in the soul of Gandhi.

UNITY bemoans the fate that has fallen upon the *Christian Science Monitor*. This newspaper seemed to us to mark a new epoch in the history of modern journalism. Its editorials were excellent, its special departments able, and its news standards immeasurably superior to anything ever known before in the "fourth estate." It published consistently excellent accounts not of the sensational but of the important and constructive things going on in the world; to read this paper was a liberal education in contemporary affairs. Now all this threatens to be undone by the action of the directors of the Christian Science hierarchy, who have taken advantage of their recent legal victory to oust all the persons who had brought the *Monitor* to so high a state of excellence. Mr. Dixon, editor-in-chief; Mr. Paine, assistant editor; Mr. Watts, business manager; Mr. Harvey, advertising agent; Mr. Eustace, one of the trustees—all these have been removed, and the paper placed in other hands. That men responsible for such action can maintain the original standards of the *Monitor,* is of course impossible. Meanwhile, there is good news in the announcement that Mr. Dixon and his associates have come to New York, secured ample financial backing, purchased the building at 268 West 40th Street, and started an international weekly, to be known as *The Interpretor*. The prospectus indicates that the paper will be of the highest quality and will cover the whole area of modern cultural interest. What this all means to Christian Science as a religion and a church, is another story which some day will be told.

The "duster" that brushed so deftly the "mirrors of Downing Street" and then the "glass of fashion," has now been applied to the "painted windows" of the church. With a somewhat kindlier feeling and a gentler touch, the formidable "gentleman" who wields the now famous "duster" brushes up such distinguished churchmen for our inspection as Bishop Gore, Dean Inge, Dr. L. P. Jacks, General Bramwell Booth, Dr. W. E. Orchard, Bishop Temple, the Archbishop of Canterbury and others. But his judgment on the church, if not on all of its leaders, is inexorable. He speaks of its "ignoble situation in the affections of men." He marvels that it "exercises so little power in the affairs of the human race." He declares that it has not only lost all power, but "now ceases to be even attractive." Continuing, he says:

> Something is wrong with the Church. It is impious to think that heaven interposed in the affairs of humanity to produce that ridiculous mouse, the modern curate. No teacher in the history of the world ever occupied a lower place in the respect of men. So deep is the pit into which the modern minister has fallen that no one attempts to get him out. . . .

Why is the Church so powerless? . . . Is it not because she has nothing to give, nothing to teach?

This is the anonymous author's conclusion after a not unsympathetic study of twelve distinguished clergymen of England, whom he describes in varying measure as good men, able scholars, sincere Christians, and one at least (Dean Inge) as having a mind as great as any other in the English nation today. Could anything be more pitiful! The utter collapse of the Christian church has never been more poignantly or definitely portrayed.

Mr. Edison started an immense amount of discussion some time ago, when he told of the "ignorance" of the college graduates who applied to him for employment. The publication of the questions which he asked these men, by way of examination, led to a great thrashing out of the problem as to what constitutes an educated man. Most critics contented themselves with thumping Mr. Edison, and offered no suggestions themselves as to real tests of education. A professor at the University of Chicago, however, has framed a series of questions which he believes go to the root of the matter. They make no reference to dates or places, to great men or great books. They touch no problems of mathematics, no facts of history, no practical knowledge of ways and means. And yet, says the professor, "if you can answer yes to all these questions, you are truly educated." Here they are:

Has education given you any sympathy with all the good causes and made you espouse them?
Has it made you public-spirited?
Has it made you a brother to the weak?
Have you learned how to make friends and keep them?
Do you know what it is to be a friend yourself?
Can you look an honest man or a pure woman in the eye?
Do you see anything to love in a little child?
Can you be high-minded and happy in the drudgeries of life?
Do you think that washing dishes and hoeing corn is just as compatible with high thinking as playing piano or golf?
Are you good for anything yourself?
Can you be happy alone?
Can you look out on the world and see anything but dollars and cents?
Can you look into a mud puddle by the wayside and see a clear sky?
Can you see anything in the puddle but mud?

We think these questions well worth considering. They suggest at least one very important conclusion —that education has something to do with ethics and religion!

The Book of the New Reformation

(A Review of John Haynes Holmes' "New Churches for Old.")

Most people who think seriously about the condition of religion in its organized form, realize that an epochal crisis is at hand, and that some new Reformation must emerge out of the chaos of the present if the churches are to be saved as institutions of vital control. Ideas as to what this Reformation shall be like, vary from the revivalism of Billy Sunday and the "fundamentalism" of the reactionaries, to the Community Church movement. The confusion which results from the welter of these conflicting conceptions is obvious everywhere; therefore there has been great need for a full, fearless, clear presentation of the conditions as they exist, together with some definite, constructive suggestions as to future development.

This is the task which John Haynes Holmes has set himself and which he has accomplished in his latest book, "New Churches for Old," a volume of considerable size, issued in flaming red covers which will surely catch the eyes of Senator Lush, *et al.*

Perhaps the outstanding feature of the book is its comprehensiveness. Unlike most of the early literature of the Protestant Reformation, this is not hastily thrown together. It is not a series of fierce diatribes struck off in the heat of debate and passionate argument, but is rather the result of several years of growing conviction and experience on Mr. Holmes' part. The author approaches the problem from the historic view-point. He tries to set every question of importance against a background of relationships, and give it perspective. This method gives the work a value and importance which could not be gained by a brief dogmatic statement of the case.

As in all the previous works of Mr. Holmes, there is vigorous and terse expression. There are many epigrammatic statements worthy of quotation, and some sledge-hammer blows delivered at the old ecclesiastical structure. There are some ideas which will cause a nervous chill for the timid. It would be well for them to brace themselves before plunging down the steep descents or ascending the stiff climb which awaits them. But for those who are in good trim for thought-climbing among the religious Alps, the book will be satisfying and convincing—a long-awaited statement which will serve as the first complete pronouncement of the principles of the New Reformation.

The author first declares that the churches have collapsed, the process beginning in the small rural communities and gradually spreading to the larger centers of population, until they have lost influence, and the "ecclesiastical catastrophe" has happened. This is largely because "the churches are identified with ideas and practices of life in which the modern man has not the slightest interest of any kind." This is true, not only of the orthodox and so-called backward denominations, but it is also true of the so-called

liberal organizations who are prone to think themselves superior to other branches of Christendom. "Hence the gulf of separation which now divides the world."

Mr. Holmes finds that there are two types of religion today; one, the religion inside the churches which is denominationalism; the other, the religion outside the churches, which is democracy. The first, he deplores as subversive of the true spiritual values and as disruptive of the unity which should hold the world together. Protestantism, instead of working out a higher form of spiritual life, has merely created "an open field of opportunity, in which intolerance can act for the rank development of a denominationalism which was impossible under the triumphant tyranny of the Papal hierarchy. . . . In essence it is the emergence, into modern times, of all that was worst in the medieval church." The Protestant churches have lost their public character as a result, and have degenerated into private institutions and are sustained for private ends. "Denominationalism may be briefly described as a division of religious forces on trivial issues to the service of private ends."

Religion outside the churches, according to the author, is more vital, free, creative than the denominationalism within it. Not yet expressed in formal terms, it is a spirit reaching out toward larger, richer life. This new religion, "democracy, is not here, but is coming! Some day there shall be among us *a free fellowship of free men, to the end of the common service of the common good.*"

Mr. Holmes has none of the recent cynicism regarding democracy which is evident on all sides in conversations, lectures, books and articles. He recognizes the difficulties before us in making democracy efficient, but he cleaves to it as an ideal. It is his passion and ultimate hope. It is the foundation of his religion and the informing spirit in his church-to-be.

The old dogmatism, founded on *a priori,* inductive methods, must be swept aside and a new method of religious reasoning must be introduced, namely, the inductive. We must begin with facts, with experience, with *behavior,* as the latest psychologists would put it, and then ascend from the known to the unknown. Here is fine heresy! Let the mystic now drain some stout draughts of brimming Nuxated Iron, for listen —"it is man first, and not God! It is as much of God only as man may seem to suggest or prove! Above all, is it God revealed by man, and not man by God!" "Sniff, sniff," quoth the carping critic, "I smell the blood of a humanist." And this lyric passage, beautiful, but full of emptiness for the "God intoxicated"— "Religion is simply the supreme expression of human nature; it is man thinking his highest, feeling his deepest, and living his best!" Can't you see a theological professor in a fundamentalist school flapping his large ears, blinking his small eyes, and straining for sufficient breath through his pinched nose, when that rises before him! Defining religion without mentioning God, or the infinite, or the eternal or not even the "not ourselves"!

In reading the chapter on "Sacred and Secular," the reviewer could not help wondering why Mr. Holmes should devote so much space to a matter which would seem to be so platitudinous. He hammers against the old idea that there are things sacred and things secular, using his sledge-blows with hearty good will. One wonders if he is not slaying a corpse, but he maintains, and probably with good justification, that the old attitude still persists. If there is any criticism to be made of the book it is probably along this line, suggested by Mr. Holmes' frequent and vigorous statement of what many might call the obvious. But he does this with a definite purpose, namely, to make a thoroughly adequate statement of the case which will appeal to all people in all possible stages of theological and ecclesiastical evaluation.

It is in that portion of the book which deals with the constructive aspects of the Community Church movement that Mr. Holmes does his most original and fundamental work. Very little has been done in this direction heretofore, perhaps the most ambitious attempt being Mr. Jackson's volume on "A Community Church." But this was unfortunately too much a personal story. Brief, but incisive pamphlets have been written by Mr. Joseph McAfee blazing the trail, and others have made short studies of special aspects of the question, such as Mr. Harvey D. Brown in "Sociological Aspects of the Community Church." But Mr. Holmes has carried all this thought much further and has worked out the technique of the new church in more satisfying fashion than anyone else thus far.

The following illustration is very clear and happy:

> The state will be the community functioning politically; the church will be the community functioning spiritually. . . . Take, for example, a little town in the northern part of New York! Suppose we went to this town on a certain Wednesday night, when the town meeting was being held. There we would see some two or three hundred persons gathered together as citizens for the consideration of the social business of the community. Now suppose we stayed over in this town until the following Sunday, and went to church. We would then discover that this town had a single church which was not denominational but "community" in character. . . . When we entered this gathering on Sunday morning and looked about us, we would discover that we were in the midst of exactly the same two or three hundred persons whom we had seen in the town meeting on the previous Wednesday night. This church, in other words, is simply the community gathered together on Sunday morning for the fostering of the common religious life of the people. . . . They are members of the church for the same reason that they are members of the town meeting—*because they are citizens!*

Mr. Holmes then fills in the details of the picture—the method of organizing, the type of religious education, etc. Here and there are examples of the new ecclesiastical order emerging in various forms and experiments, but for the most part, as Mr. Holmes sug-

gests, the Community Church does not yet exist except as a prophecy. Therefore the details must necessarily be also matters of creative imagination. His contributions are suggestive and stimulating and will furnish material for further experiment in many sections of the country for a long time. And he further answers many of the objections which have so far been raised against the movement.

There are one or two points in closing which raise profound queries or doubts, which time alone can adequately test. For instance, this statement,—"A community church at any one time will be what its community is at that same time." The problem here is one of the fundamental problems of all democratic institutions—shall it merely reflect, or shall it lead? Could we not say that the ideal of the Community Church is to be not merely what the community *is* but to uphold before it what the community should be? We agree with Mr. Holmes that the roots of this new movement must run down into people's lives, into the great universal realities. But let us hope that it will grow out of these lines into a rarer and finer atmosphere above what men are into what they ought to be!—and finally, the problem of how the Community Church shall become truly international not only in spirit but in organization is one of the next problems to which all believers must give their best attention.

The book is heartily commended to all persons who are doing serious thinking on the problem of the church in the modern world. Those who do not believe in the community church as the way out should read it as the best statement of the case by their opponents. Those who do believe in it should read it for the sake of re-enforcing their own convictions and adding to their ammunition. And to those who are not doing any real thinking at all on the subject, let us say that if this does not stir them, they are hopeless.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

The Four-Power Alliance

We are frankly surprised and disappointed by the action of the Senate in accepting the Four-Power Alliance. It has seemed inconceivable to us that a body which had rejected a league of nations should accept an alliance of powers; or that a citizenry that had seen so clearly what was behind the Versailles Covenant, should not see with equal clearness what was behind the Washington Treaty. What we failed to reckon with was the agreement for naval disarmament, which accompanied the alliance for the Far East. It was this which held the attention and won the support of the people. They wanted this, as a release from the intolerable burden of competitive navies, and if they had to accept other compacts in order to secure this, they were not unwilling to do so. Fish before this have swallowed hook, line and sinker for the sake of a piece of bait!

For any good that may be proposed by the Alliance, the Treaty is utterly ineffectual. Its purpose in this regard, of course, is the avoidance of war, and to this end it proposes no method but that of conference! When did conference ever prevent a war that was really immanent? What did the Hague organization, which was wholly built around the idea of conference, ever accomplish in the way of peace? In a crisis in Asia comparable to that in Europe in 1914, what chance would the four nations have of even coming together for discussion? So far as the ostensible object of the Alliance is concerned, the agreement promises nothing. It is a reed already broken!

But who believes that the avoidance of war is what the four powers are really concerned with in this Alliance? What we have is fundamentally a sanctification of all the conquest and capture, rapine and rape, which have stained the Pacific with blood these many generations, just as we had in the League of Nations a sanctification of the nameless abominations of the Versailles Peace. The Alliance is a pledging of the military and naval forces of the four powers to the maintenance of present conditions in the Pacific, no matter how outrageous or how menacing to peace and progress, just as the League was the establishment of a preponderance of power for the preservation of the *status quo* precipitated by the fall of Germany. Worst of all, this Alliance marks the definite entrance of the United States into the business of imperialistic piracy in the Pacific, as the agreement on China constitutes a similar invitation to join the freebooters already on the scene in the looting of the Celestial Empire. America, in other words, is at last recognized as a full-fledged capitalistic power. England, Japan, and France would ignore her if they could, but such policy is no longer possible. America is powerful, and she is hungry! So the robbers offer her membership in their band, with the pledge, so familiar in the organization of all conspiracies against the public welfare, of one for all and all for one!

It is this which we have accepted, with loud huzzas, from a disarmament conference in the name of peace! As though all of us who have cut our eye-teeth do not know that alliances, from the beginning of recorded history to the present moment, have been organized primarily for the protection and advancement of the selfish interests of the parties concerned, and that peace, if it results at all, for any considerable period of time, is at the best an incident, and at the worst

an accident. An enduring peace, such as we had a right to believe that the Washington Conference was seeking, must be found and laid hold on by quite a different method.

"Protective alliances," says the *New Republic,* with much wisdom, "are fundamentally a negative safeguard against war rather than a positive organization of peace. . . . If the nations wish to get rid of armaments and war, it is not enough abstractly to agree to keep the peace. They must provide some machinery for accomplishing the international changes which wars have accomplished in the past. Alliances . . . are intended for the benefit of vested political interests which dread desirable changes and which seek to protect their possessions or privileges under the pretence of keeping the peace."

Peace, in other words, was not what the Conference was after in this Treaty. If the nations had really desired to attain peace, as their first objective, they would have created, or at least tried to create, a very different type of international organization. As it was, they made a traditional and wholly futile gesture of peace, and then went about their main business, which was that of securing a condition of imperialistic "normalcy" in the Pacific.

It is our judgment that the Four-Power Alliance should have been repudiated as the League of Nations was repudiated, and for the same reasons. Its acceptance goes far toward justifying the cynical charge that Secretary Hughes' program for limitation of armaments is a mere devise for cutting down the overhead expenses of imperialism.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The World Significance of Mahatma Gandhi*

As I enter this morning upon the discussion of Mahatma Gandhi, of India, and of the universal significance of the work which he is doing in his native country, I am irresistibly reminded of the day, which was not so long ago, when I first had the pleasure of presenting this man to this congregation, and of declaring my conviction, the same now as it was then, that Gandhi is incomparably the greatest man now living in the world. How the situation has changed in these few months! At that time Gandhi's name was practically unknown outside the borders of India. I hit upon it by the merest chance; and, although I came to feel upon the instant that here was a creative spiritual genius of the first order, my information was of the meagrest description. Furthermore, all endeavors to get additional information met with failure. Today, however, Gandhi's name is appearing on the first pages of all the newspapers. Scores of articles have been published in the magazines and reviews of this country, England and the continent. A great journal, the New York World, sends its leading correspondent to India to "spy out the land," and he returns to write of Gandhi and his policy of non-violence and non-co-operation. From almost utter obscurity, this man mounts in a few months to a fame which is as universal as it promises to be immortal. He holds today the center of the world's attention. That position of primacy held so proudly by Woodrow Wilson in 1918 and 1919, and by Nicolai Lenin in 1920 and 1921, is now occupied by a little Oriental who has never held any official position, who seeks neither glory nor power, and who languishes this day† behind the bars of an English jail.

For such a change as this in the fortunes of a single man, there must be reasons. As it happens, these reasons are not far to seek. I would name this morning four events, as indications of what has been transpiring of late in this far distant portion of the world.

In the first place, there is the amazing growth of the nationalist party in India. A few years ago, the only persons who wanted *Swaraj,* or independence, were a few extremists and fanatics. The great majority of the intellectual leaders cherished no desire or expectation other than that of home rule, or dominion status within the Empire. As for the masses of the common people, they were either ignorant or totally indifferent to the issues involved. Today however, the movement for emancipation from British rule has swept like a prairie fire from one end of India to the other. It is true that the native princes and their retainers, many thousands of civic officials and their servants, and certain well-educated and prosperous groups in the community who naturally oppose any change in the *status quo,* are hearty supporters of the English government in India; but these people, taken all together, would not number more than a million individuals. All the rest, from the highest to the lowest, from Rabindranath Tagore on the one side to the meanest of the "untouchables" on the other, are all aflame with the desire for independence from the British yoke. Remember now, if you will, that the population of India is well over 300,000,000, one-fifth of the population of the entire globe, and it is not difficult to understand why this nationalist movement is suddenly attracting so much attention. What is going on in India today, if only because of the stupendous numbers involved, is the central phenomenon in the world's life.

In the second place, as another reason for Gandhi's rapid rise to fame, there is the fact that he is today definitely recognized as the leader of his people in their revolt against the English crown. A few years ago Gandhi was a friend of England and her rule in India. More than once he had received favors and rewards at the hands of the imperial government. During the Great War he supported the Allied cause, and, in so far as it was possible for a non-resistant so to do, upheld the power and authority of English arms. After the War he advocated no reform more drastic than a reasonable measure of home rule. It was the massacre of Amritsar, when General Dyer turned his machine guns on an innocent crowd of Indians, killed between three and four hundred men, women and children, and wounded I know not how many more, that changed the soul of Gandhi. From that time on he became an open enemy of England, and an ardent champion of freedom. One year ago last December the All-India Congress formally endorsed his program of non-violence and non-co-operation. This last December, less than three months ago, the congress reaffirmed the program by an overwhelming majority, and named Gandhi as the leader of the movement for independence. This man holds abso-

*Copies of this article in pamphlet form may be secured of the Community Church, New York, at 10 cents each. Apply Secretary, 61 E. 34 Street.

†This sermon was preached on March 12, 1922, the day following the arrest of Gandhi for sedition.

lutely in his hands today the destinies of his people. When Gandhi speaks, it is India that speaks. When Gandhi acts, it is India that acts. When Gandhi is arrested, it is India that is outraged and humiliated. More truly, I believe, than any other man who has ever lived, this great Indian is the incarnation of a people's soul.

Thirdly, as an explanation of Gandhi's fame and influence at this moment, there is the repressive policy recently adopted by the English government. Why any government should turn to repression in a crisis like this, is explicable only on the supposition that governments are utterly ignorant of history and human psychology, and learn nothing from experience. For repression has never worked. I challenge anybody to point me to a single episode in either ancient or modern history, which proves that repression has even once achieved the end to which it has been directed. This policy has certainly been no success in English hands. It failed in America in 1775, it failed in English domestic affairs in the '20s and the '40s of the last century, it failed in South Africa after the Boer War, it failed in Ireland yesterday, and it will fail in India tomorrow. If repression succeeds in anything, it is in advertising the cause of the enemy. "We are advertised by our loving friends," says Shakespeare; to which I would make the addition that we are advertised as well by our fearful enemies! Nothing that the Indians could have done of themselves would have spread such knowledge of, and won such sympathy for, their movement for independence as the policy of the British authorities in recent months. When the Ali brothers were arrested, for example, news of the event spread to the remotest corners of the Mohammedan world, and made every Moslem a champion of freedom for India. When Lajpat Rai was seized and imprisoned, thousands of Englishmen and Americans were immediately aroused, for they knew this man to be a scholar and a gentleman, and could not understand the nature of a situation which made necessary his confinement. So also, now with Gandhi himself! Millions of people the world around know him today, and will believe in and love him passionately tomorrow, because they see a saint doomed to martyrdom by the tyranny of imperialism.

Lastly, as an indication of what has been going on in recent months, I would remind you of the visit of the Prince of Wales to India. For sheer stupidity I know of nothing to compare with this event. We are told that this trip was planned in order to demonstrate the loyalty of the people of India to the British crown. As a matter of fact, had the Indians been loyal, there would have been no necessity for a royal visitation. The very exigencies of the situation made inevitable just the opposite result from what was intended or desired. No sooner was the Prince's journey announced, than Gandhi organized his boycott—not because he had anything against this innocent young man used by a distracted government for a disreputable purpose, but because he saw in his coming a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate how the Indian people felt about English rule. As soon as the Prince arrived this boycott was put into effect. Everywhere he went the natives met him with averted eyes and turned backs. Finally, at Allahabad, they refused to meet him at all. When the Prince of Wales entered this place, it was as though he were arrived at a city of the dead. Streets were deserted; doors were barred, and shutters drawn at the windows; while the people by the thousands swarmed to a rendezvous outside the town to acclaim *Swaraj*, and pledge themselves to its support. The visit of the Prince of Wales, now drawing to a close, has been simply one vast demonstration of Indian unrest. More than anything else that has happened, or could have happened, it has taught the world of Gandhi and his great crusade for liberty.

Such are some of the events which have conspired in recent months to draw the attention of mankind to India. In so far as these events have enabled men to know who Gandhi is and what he is doing, they are beneficent, for I can imagine no truer baptism of the soul than knowledge of this eastern saint. To those who understand what it means in terms of inward purity and outward devotion, his name falls on the heart "like the gentle dew from heaven." From another and more important point of view, however, these events must be regarded as unfortunate, for they are tending to present Gandhi to the world simply as a leader of a nationalistic cause. They are teaching men to classify the Indian Mahatma with such historical figures as William Tell, William Wallace, Robert Emmett, Kosciusko, George Washington, and Garibaldi, as the champion of the liberties of an enslaved people. This, of course, he is! Gandhi stands today at the forefront of his nation's life, as we have seen, and matches in heroic service of freedom the achievements of any of the great nationalistic leaders of the past. But it is a deplorable mistake to look at Gandhi exclusively or even primarily from this standpoint. He is more than the leader of a movement for national independence—his task is nobler even than that of championing the political emancipation of a great people. Dear to his heart as is the deliverance of India from English rule, immediate as is his concern with this great cause at the present moment, it must still be reckoned as a mere incident in his career, a passing episode in a life devoted to higher and further issues. If the movement for independence had never appeared, Gandhi would still be the same transcendent figure that he is today; and if this movement ended tomorrow, in defeat or victory, Gandhi's real work would still go on to its appointed end. That there must be something wrong with an idea which classifies this man with Wallace, Washington, and Garibaldi, all of whom were soldiers who drew blood on the field of battle, is shown conclusively by the fact that Gandhi is a non-resistant who refuses to take the sword, even to fight for liberty, but appeals to a "higher law" than that of violence, namely "strength of spirit." What we have here in the case of Gandhi, as always in the case of the non-resistant, is a religious leader, a man not of local, or national, but of universal significance. It is in the realm of the spirit that Gandhi "lives and moves and has his being." It is not primarily with the kings and premiers, but with God and the soul of man, that he does business. Above and beyond the political liberation of his own or any other people, he seeks the spiritual redemption of mankind. If we would classify him with any of the supreme figures of human history, it must be with such august religious prophets as Confucius and Lao-tse, Buddha, Zoroaster and Mohammed, and, most truly of all, the Nazarene! Out of Asia, at long intervals of time, have arisen these inspired witnesses of God. One by one they have appeared to teach men by precept and example the law of life, and therewith to save the race. Today, in this our time, there comes another of this sacred line, the Mahatma of India. In all reverence and with due regard for historic fact, I match this man with Jesus

Christ! If the lives of these two were written side by side, as Plutarch wrote the lives of the great heroes of Greece and Rome, it would be amazing to see to what extent they are identical. With Gandhi, only one experience is lacking—that of the crucifixion; but in the light of what is taking place, it would seem as though we could trust the British Empire today, as the Roman Empire yesterday, to point the road to Calvary!

Now it is of this universal significance of Gandhi as a spiritual leader, that I want to speak to you this morning. I find this significance most clearly typified, at least for the beginning of our discussion, in the personal character of the man. We can best get at this aspect of the problem by asking how it is that Gandhi has managed to acquire such a marvelous influence over the Indian people. Of the nature of this influence, there can be no question; it is one of the most extraordinary personal phenomena in the world today. As Gandhi moves from place to place, great multitudes of men and women follow him, as similar multitudes followed Jesus in Palestine. When he appears to speak in some town or city, crowds running all the way from twenty-five to seventy-five thousand people gather to hear his words. That he is a wonder-worker is implicity believed by the ignorant and superstitious, and stories of his miracles are now the legend of the countryside. Everywhere he is called Mahatma, the "saint" or "blessed one," for already the people reverence him as one who is divine. To find anything to match this influence of Gandhi over his people, we would have to return to ancient times and remote places, and even then the parallel would be incomplete. It is the testimony of a competent and unbiased observer that Gandhi's personal following is greater in numbers, and more devoted and disciplined in spirit, than any man history has ever known.

If we seek for the explanation of this fact, we cannot find it, I believe, in any of the ordinary aspects of personality. It does not reside, for example, in Gandhi's physical presence, which has been described as "pitifully insignificant." Thus he weighs less than one hundred pounds. He shows all the weakness and emaciation of one who has disciplined his body to an asceticism of an extreme type for over thirty years. On occasion he is so feeble that he is unable to stand, and has to address his audiences while seated in a chair. His only impressive physical feature is his eyes, which glow with the flaming passion of a spirit which burns as though it would consume the flesh.—So, also, I cannot find that his personal influence has its origin in any extraordinary degree of intellectuality. Gandhi does not impress me as having exceptional mental powers. Certainly he is not to be compared with such an intellectual giant as Leo Tolstoy. To me, at least, it is inconceivable that the Indian could write such books as "War and Peace," "Anna Karenina," or even "My Religion." Great as he is, Gandhi does not seem to move on this plane of achievement at all!—I feel the same way, also, about his gifts as an orator. I speak with some hesitancy here, for the standards of oratory, as of music, may be very different in the East from what they are in the West. What is genuine eloquence in India may not be recognizable as such at all in the United States. But I might as well confess that Gandhi, so far as I can judge from his printed addresses, does not impress me as an orator. I find in his utterances no such magic of words as we are familiar with in the case of men like Edmund Burke and Patrick Henry. I had difficulty, for example, in selecting a passage from Gandhi's writings which had the lift and beauty, the soaring grandeur of style, which made it appropriate for reading as scripture in this service. That Gandhi can work a spell over an audience we know from abundant testimony, but it must be for reasons quite apart from eloquence of speech.

What is it that the Indians see when they look upon this man, and hail him as Mahatma? Not a great physical presence, not a gigantic intellect, not an inspired orator, but a personality or charater of transcendent spiritual beauty. What they see, first of all, is a man who has made his life to be at one with the great masses of the people. Gandhi was well born, of a family with ample means, and was given the best educational advantages both in his own country and in England. When he returned to Bombay, he began his career as a practitioner of the law. Then he did what so few men in any age have ever done! Instead of climbing up, *up* the ladder of achievement to wealth and fame, and thus away from the common people, he proceeded deliberately to move *down*—down to the depths of human misery and woe, down to where men toiled desperately and died miserably, down to the dark places of sweat and tears and blood. From the beginning he was resolved that there should be no suffering among men which he did not endure, no outrage which he did not feel, no cross which he did not carry. Even the "untouchables" should not be beneath his comradeship—to them he would descend, and with them share the bitterness of the world's contempt! The experience of men, in other words, down to its remotest horror, he made his own; and always, in his long struggles for reform, met first himself the hazards to which he invited others. How beautiful, for example, is the story of his leading the Hinlu "coolies" in South Africa out on to the land, in revolt against the inequities of government! Here Gandhi was the first to sleep on the bare ground, beneath the stars; the first to practise the vow of poverty which he enjoined upon his followers; and the first to cultivate the land for sustenance! How impressive also the most recent and much more famous story of the loin-cloth! Talk with any enemy of Gandhi, and almost at once he will mention the loin-cloth episode, and offer it as proof of the Mahatma's insane fanaticism. What is this episode? Some months ago, in the prosecution of his non-co-operation campaign against the government, Gandhi ordered his followers to boycott all cotton goods imported from England, destroy whatever foreign cloth or clothing they had on hand, and spin what they needed on their own domestic spindles. It soon developed that obedience to this command would cause great inconvenience and even suffering, especially among the poor, by stripping them practically naked of the little that they had. At once Gandhi appeared in public, on the country highways and even in the cities, clad in nothing but a loin-cloth, that no man in all the land should be embarrassed by a poverty greater than his own. Such deeds are a commonplace in Gandhi's life. His whole career reveals a positive passion for community of experience with mankind. When his people look upon him, therefore, they see not a leader merely but a comrade and a brother, one who is in all things like unto themselves; and of course they reverence him as one who is divine.

This deliberate kinship with the masses of his fellow-countrymen leads us to another quality which is fundamental in any estimate of Gandhi's personality. I refer to his self-abnegation, his sacrifice, his capacity for

suffering. Very early in his career Gandhi discovered what he called "the law of conscious suffering"—the truth that the mastery of the world waits upon the man who is willing not to make others suffer, but to suffer himself; and his whole life has been a discipline to its attainment. At the outset he sacrificed his property, his social standing, his profession, everything that could separate him from entire devotion to his fellow-men. In his personal habits he began and still continues to practice an asceticism that might well be the envy of a medieval monk. In his work as a reformer he has evaded no penalty, but has accepted gladly the punishments imposed upon him as only so many weapons to his hand. He has faced an assassin without flinching. Four times, in South Africa and in India, he has been imprisoned. Thrice he has been beaten by mobs, and once left prone in the gutter as one dead. His body bears the stripes of the whips with which he has been lashed, his wrists and ankles the marks of the chains with which he has been bound for hours together to the iron bars of his cell. Read Paul's catalogue of sufferings, and you find it a less terrible array than Gandhi's! "I have gone through the most fiery ordeals that have fallen to the lot of man" is his testimony. And all because sacrifice has been deliberately chosen as the law of his life and the sword of his fray! It is this which the Indians see when they look upon the scarred and wasted frame of their leader. It is this which they remember when they think of him in some far distant part of the countryside. Imagine the stupidity of a government which hopes to break such a man, or sever him from the worship of his followers, by fresh arrest and imprisoment!

Greater than all that we have yet mentioned in the character of Gandhi, is the love with which his entire being is saturated. No man of our time, few men of any time, have risen to such heights of tenderness and compassion for mankind as this Mahatma of India. Anger, malice, resentment, hatred, have altogether disappeared from his heart, and nothing is now left but the pure essence of love for his fellow-men. And his fellow-men include all men who live upon the earth! Like God himself, Gandhi is "no respector of persons." He holds white men and black side by side within the embrace of his affection. He ends the long feud between Moslem and Hindu, and makes them brethren one of another. While recognizing certain social utilities of the caste system, he wipes out the barriers of separation in his personal relations, and seats Brahmin and "untouchable" at a common board and leads them in breaking bread together. Even the English are not excluded from his goodwill, for "love your enemies" is as stern a command for Gandhi as for Jesus. "Tell the British people that I love them, and want their association" is the word that he has spoken a thousand times. Think of his conduct at the time of the attempt upon his life in South Africa! Asked in the hospital, where he was hovering on the verge of death, to take action against his assassin, he refused. Why should I seek to injure or punish him, he said. The man did what he thought was right, risked his life for what he thought was right! I believe in that man; I shall love him, and win him to myself. And he did! In a few months the assassin was conquered by the might of Gandhi's forgiveness, and became straightway one of his most ardent followers.—Equally beautiful is Gandhi's attitude toward General Dyer, the officer responsible for the massacre at Amritsar. I cannot co-operate with him, says Gandhi; I cannot recognize his authority or obey his orders. But if he fell sick of a fever, I would hasten to his bedside and nurse him back to health.—There is no bitterness in this man, no last flickering spark of hatred or revenge. He is love incarnate. In every act and even gesture of these last years, when patient suffering has purified his soul, he has been a perpetual witness to the truth of his own great words, "Anger will serve no purpose. We must meet ungodliness by godliness. We must meet untruth by truth. We must meet cunning and craft by openness and simplicity. We must meet terrorism and frightfulness by bravery."

It is qualities such as these, which have become familiar to all Indians, that give Gandhi such a hold upon the imagination and devotion of his people. It is these same qualities, also, that give to him and his work a universal significance. Gandhi is a man who has mastered the secrets of spiritual living. His soul has been lifted, by virtue of incomparable discipline, to the measure of the stature of those realities which are of God. In humility, in sacrifice, in ardent love for men, he is one of those perfect characters which come along once in a thousand, or perhaps only in two thousand, years. And today he lies in prison. Such men are the judges of our world. A society which cannot suffer a Jesus, or a Gandhi, to be at large, is a society which is not fit to live, and by this token is already doomed to die.

A second evidence of Gandhi's universal significance is found in his doctrine of non-resistance, which he says, "does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but the pitting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant." I refer more particularly to the fact that Gandhi is the first man who has succeeded in applying the non-resistant idea on a vast scale, and in working out a technique for its successful operation in determining the great issues of social life. Gandhi, in other words, has demonstrated the feasibility of non-resistance as a method of political and economic reform, and therewith, as definitely as Newton or Darwin, opened up a new era in human history.

Hitherto non-resistance has labored under two very serious disabilities. In the first place, its practice has been limited in the past to the life of the single individual, or here and there to the experience of single and isolated groups of individuals. The great non-resistants have been Jesus, St. Francis, William Lloyd Garrison, Henry David Thoreau, Leo Tolstoy—men of transcendent personality and influence, who have exemplified nobly the possibilities of non-resistance in their own private lives, but have never attempted, or been able, to apply it on a universal scale to society at large. Occasionally, to be sure, there have appeared larger or smaller groups of men and women who have organized movements, and even whole communities, on non-resistant principles. Thus there were the Christians of the first two centuries of our era, various heretical sects of the Middle Ages, such as the Cathari, the Waldenses and the Albigenses, and such modern religious groups as the Quakers, the Mennonites, and the Doukhobors of Russia and western Canada. But these groups, like separate individuals of the Tolstoyan type, have been independent and self-contained. They have lived very largely in and for themselves, and thus are important as an example rather than as an influence. They show what non-resistance can do on a

small scale, but teach nothing about its practicability as a general social principle.

The second difficulty, under which the non-resistant gospel has suffered in the past, has been its identification with a remote or other-worldly type of life. The non-resistant of the Middle Ages was the monk of the St. Francis type, who abandoned the world and went off to live alone by himself or with his group of disciples. The supreme non-resistant of modern times was Tolstoy, who characteristically cut himself off from his family, his country, his church, and lived like a kind of hermit on the land; and at the end fled away, like a wounded animal in the brush, to die alone. These men were sublime in their personal lives. The non-resistant in all ages has marked the highest attainment of inward purity and outward sacrifice. But with few exceptions—Garrison, for example!—they have achieved virtue at the expense of contact with the world of men. From the practical point of view, the non-resistant has again and again been an ineffective man. He has solved the problems of life by running away from them. Tolstoy is one of the sublimest characters in history, but he contributed nothing to the solution of those questions that vex most terribly the society of modern times.

It is these two disabilities which have left the advocate of non-resistance helpless to commend his doctrine as an adequate method for meeting the contingencies of the modern industrial struggle, for example, or of international war. Non-resistance may be all right, he has been told, as a personal idiosyncrasy or as a means of escape from social responsibility, but it has nothing to offer the man who has to meet things as they are! And now, behold, comes Gandhi, a new type of non-resistant, a man who leads his people in the greatest movement of revolt our age has known, and does it on the basis of a program of "resist not evil"! It is this program, or technique, of non-resistance as a method of social change, as the plan of campaign in what is literally a war for national independence, that constitutes Gandhi's unique and immortal contribution to experience. Beginning with the elementary precept of "non-violence," which pledges all Indians to abstain from use of force under all circumstances, Gandhi passes on to his second and basic principle of "non-co-operation." This is only superficially a negative principle—a refusal to co-operate in any way with the English government, to accept favors or rewards, to use the courts, to send children to the schools, to buy English goods, to pay taxes, to recognize the laws. At bottom, it is a magnificently positive assertion of Indian self-sufficiency—the definite organization of a society which is politically and economically self-sustaining and therefore independent. What Gandhi is doing is teaching his people to do their own work, to manage their own affairs, to build and maintain their own institutions—and to endure in patience, not only without hatred or desire for revenge but with actual goodwill toward the enemy, whatever sufferings this policy may bring upon them from their alien rulers. He is organizing a vast program of social revolt on the basis of love—love one for another expressed in terms of mutual service, and love for the enemy expressed in terms of forgiveness and compassion. He is showing that no people needs to be helpless in the face of physical force, or to resist force with force to their own misery and destruction. All they have to do is to act together in ignoring it—to rise above it by discipline, to conquer it by suffering. "We must meet organization by greater organizing ability. We must meet discipline by great discipline, and we must meet sacrifices by infinitely greater sacrifices."

It is in this program of non-resistance, applied on a vast scale to social issues, that I find evidence of a significance in Gandhi's work which far transcends the borders alike of country and of race. If the Mahatma succeeds in his great venture, non-resistance will be made for the first time in history a universal principle of life. The reproach that it is nothing more than an eccentric rule of individual or sectarian life, will be removed. The charge that its feasibility is limited to the single life, or the unworldly habit of experience, will be answered. If Gandhi succeeds, we shall see that non-resistance is a sound method of social action, that resort to violence for any cause is no longer necessary, that for defence against aggression and in endeavors after liberty, there is "the better way" than force. If Gandhi succeeds, do I say? Gandhi has already succeeded; he has demonstrated this truth! His arrest was the final evidence of his triumph. More terrible to England than any sword, is the steadfast patience of this one little man, who in the true spirit of love, "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." In Gandhi, if men be wise, the era of force at last comes to its end, and the era of peace and brotherhood begins!

There is one final aspect of Gandhi's universal significance of which I would speak before I end this address. I can best convey to you what I mean by referring to the charge most often brought against Gandhi by his enemies, that he is a fanatic who would destroy everything that civilization has achieved in the last three hundred years. Thus it is said that he would close the hospitals in India, rip up the railroads, smash the printing presses and cotton factories, scrap the whole intricate mechanism of modern life, in a vain endeavor to restore at one stroke the simpler ways of an earlier and more primitive day. Now, that Gandhi is thus a mad wrecker of the machinery of society as we know it today, is obviously disproved by the fact that he himself makes constant use of the various devices which are the commonplace of our time. Thus when he was so desperately wounded by the assassin in South Africa, he went to a hospital and was there nursed back to health by an Englishwoman who had come to know the kind of man he was. In India he travels constantly from place to place on the railroads. The other day, when extraordinary speed was necessary, he made the journey in a high-powered automobile. His use of the printing-press is constant and most effective.

There is truth, however, in the statement that Gandhi is fighting the machine of western civilization in India, and seeking to restore the native and therefore primitive culture of his people. It is just this which marks, to my mind, the culminating evidence of his genius as a spiritual leader. For Gandhi, as he looks upon his country today, sees it subjected to a two-fold yoke. On the one hand, there is the yoke of English government—the bondage of an alien political system, against which the nationalist movement is now being directed. On the other hand, there is the yoke of capitalism—that economic system which uses the vast machinery of modern invention for the exploitation of the many to the profit of the few. To Gandhi, release from this economic system of western capitalism is as important for India as release from

the political system of British imperialism. If English rule is overthrown, only to leave behind it English railroads, English factories, English promoting companies, and so on, the Indian people will have gained only the substance and not the shadow of independence. They will still be enslaved, and enslaved to a system which is fatal to the best interests of humanity. At the heart of this western civilization of ours, Gandhi believes, is death and not life. We have created a vast machine which proves to be a Frankenstein which is devouring us. This monster has bound us to the wheel of labor, deceived us with the lure of wealth, degraded us to the base uses of materialism, leveled to the ground our standards of moral and spiritual idealism. Even in a physical sense it is a failure, for in the end it brings only such calamity as the Great War. It is this system of economic ruin which Gandhi sees coming into Asia, after having conquered and ravaged our western world. He sees it victorious in Japan, he sees it invading China, he sees it planted at the heart of India—*and he declares war aginst it!* He fights the opium trade, he battles against the liquor traffic, he substitutes the domestic spindle for the factory loom, he denounces the railroad, the automobile, and the machine in general. What Gandhi is attempting to do is to save India from the blight of western materialism by restoring her own native civilization and culture before it is too late. He is trying to preserve his land from the curse of commercialism, the horror of machine exploitation and production, the slavery of wage labor, the whole black system of capitalistic life. And he would do this not for its own sake, but for the sake of India's soul. He would save the spirit of his people—their simplicity, their art, their religion, their mystic comradeship with one another and with God.

It is here, in this great service, that Gandhi becomes in very truth the great religious leader of whom I spoke in the beginning. It is in this work of spiritual redemption that he takes on a universal significance, for the West as well as for the East. For in saving India, Gandhi is saving the world. In staying the ravages of capitalism in his own land, he is starting a movement which, by process of reaction, will flow back into our world and restore to us those things of the spirit which we have lost. Our western civilization is in exactly the situation of Rome in the days of the great Caesar. It has mastered the world by the power of its arms, and is exploiting its resources and peoples to its own advantage. As its outward glory increases, however, its inward disintegration proceeds. At the critical moment in Roman history, there appeared Jesus and the Christians, who brought to the perishing world a new source of life which preserved its vitality for a period of two thousand years. At the critical moment in our not dissimilar age, there appears Gandhi! Does he not also bring with him a new life of the spirit, and may he not therefore be truly hailed as the savior of the world?

It is thus that I would speak of the universal significance of Mahatma Gandhi and his work in India. The parallel with Jesus constantly presents itself. The Nazarene was a divine personality; he taught the law of love, and laid down a program of non-resistance for its fulfillment; he sought to establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth by dethroning Mammon in favor of God. So also with Gandhi! This Indian is a saint in his personal life; he teaches the law of love, and non-resistance as its practice; and he seeks the establishment of a new social order which shall be a kingdom of the spirit. If I believed in "the second coming," as I do not, I should dare to assert that Gandhi was Jesus come back to earth. But if "the second coming" has no historical validity, it has at least poetical significance; and in this sense, can we not speak of Gandhi as indeed the Christ? In a little book called "The Scourge of Christ," sent me by the author, Paul Richard, from the foot of the Himalaya mountains, where he lives, I find two remarkable sentences:

"If Christ came again, would he not choose again to be a son of an enslaved people, rather than a citizen of the empire?"

"The Christ, if he comes, will not be of the white race; the colored peoples could not put their faith in him."

Is not this the prophecy of Gandhi? Does not this prove him to be the Christ of our age? Today, as in the olden time, it is no longer a question as to whether Christ is here or not. It is a question only of who will recognize and follow him!

—*John Haynes Holmes.*

BEREAVEMENT.

I had a friend who kept close to the crowd,
And with the crowd he went away to war;
And he was full of trust, and young and proud:
High were the ideals he was fighting for!
And though I thought his hope a wanton wraith,
I loved him for his young and honest faith.

I had a friend who chose a prison cell
Because he could not kill as others could;
What he went through was worse than any hell,
But young and brave, he lived his brotherhood.
And though I could not play so pure a part,
I loved him for the cleanness of his heart.

I had a friend whose eyes were all aglow
With visions weary cynics like to flout;
I lived to see his youthful fire burn low
Beneath the olden sneers, and flicker out.
He looks no longer to the morning sky,
And saddened, I have seen a young soul die.

The World Tomorrow. —*D. A.*

THE SHIPS OF HOPE.

The little ships of Hope I send
To face the cruel and surging sea
Are bound for distant, shining ports
Where victory must surely be.

I watch them from a barren hill
Toss on the grey and cheerless wave
And wonder how it is that Hope
Still holds me such a willing slave.

Few gallant dreams survive the storm;
Life's net, so close, so strong and fine,
Draws up the tiny, helpless craft,
So fragile and so near divine.

But oh, I see one splendid truth
Cling to the far horizon's slope:
My brothers send their dreams with mine
And join with me in hope for Hope!

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

UNITY Fellowship Associates

As space permits we will print from time to time the names of those who have enlisted as UNITY Fellowship Associates by signing the Bond of Union (see inside cover page). We believe that membership in this Association represents a real and active interest in the ideals which UNITY advocates. We hope that it may be the means of making like-minded people, scattered over this and other countries, known to each other. UNITY desires to be of real service to such and hopes to print many signatures. Correspondence solicited.—EDS.

CALIFORNIA—
Berkeley: Alvin E. Hottell, Box 59.
Campbell: A. G. Peterson, Box 58, S. J. & L. G. Rd.; Mrs. A. G. Peterson, Box 58, S. J. & L. G. Rd.
Kentfield: Mrs. William Kent.
Los Gatos: Mrs. Rose G. Heeb, 320 Bella Vista Ave.; Rev. Arthur B. Heeb, 320 Bella Vista Ave.; Mrs. H. Lovell, 93 Broadway; Esther M. Peterson; Silvia Martin; Owen W. Caldwell, 22 Tait Ave.; Elizabeth D. Chase, 222 Tait Ave.; Jennie L. Hamilton, 139 Wilder Ave.; Mrs. Mabie, 138 Wilder Ave.; Miss May Wightman, Box 8; Mrs. Frances Mews Brown, Box 76; J. L. Brown, Box 76; George E. Fox, 25 Elmwood; Minette J. Waterman, 45 Broadway; Mrs. Elizabeth O'Donnell; Phoebe E. Edwards, Hillcrest Orchard; Mrs. O. W. Caldwell, 22 Tait Ave.
Pasadena: Dr. Allen Ruppell, 884 So. Los Robles Ave.
Redlands: Rev. Robert Whitaker, 320 W. Colton Ave.
Oakland: Mrs. Meta J. Erickson, 109 Monticeto Ave.

COLORADO—
Crawford: Rev. Victor E. Southworth.

CONNECTICUT—
New Haven: Alfred Ward Smith, 917 Howard Ave.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—
Washington: Mr. A. T. Randall, 2700 Connecticut Ave.; Miss Frances S. Crosby, 925 N St., N. W.

ILLINOIS—
Altona: Mrs. Caroline A. Bone.
Easton: Henry Heberling.
Lake Forest: Miss Catherine Colvin.
Oak Park: Mrs. I. S. Rosenfels, 333 Linden Ave.
Chicago: Mrs. O. T. Knight, St. George Hotel; Mrs. Warren McArthur, 4852 Kenwood Ave.; Edward Arthur Rockwood, 126 South Hall, University of Chicago; Mrs. Amalie Hofer Jerome, 6427 Greenwood Ave.; Taraknath Das, Room 501, Hearst Bldg.; Mrs. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, 700 Oakwood Blvd.; May Johnson, 700 Oakwood Blvd.

IOWA—
Humboldt: Rev. Albert Mobbs, Box 44; Mrs. Eleanor Mobbs, Box 44.

KANSAS—
Linwood: A. A. Quinlan.
Norwich: Mr. Alvin E. Hottell.

LOUISIANA—
New Orleans: Miss Josephine Riess, 1423 Milan St.

MASSACHUSETTS—
Arlington: Lindsay K. Foster, 25 Irving Road; Helen L. Hatch, 32 Norfolk Road.
Ashby: Dorothy T. Wilder; Mrs. Albert M. Wilder.
Boston: L. Colin Summers, 79 Robert St.; Rev. Harold Guy Don Scott, 22 Bellevista Road.
Brookline: Laura M. Kendrick, 44 Cummings Road; Miss Alice J. Kuehn, 1618 Beacon St.; Rev. Henry W. Pinkham, 7 Wellington Terrace.
Jamaica Plain: Rev. James E. Fairley, 25 Aldworth St.
Northfield: George L. Thompson.
No. Wilmington: Mrs. Grace T. Lopans; R. Gene Lopans.
Pittsfield: Rev. Charles R. Joy, 47 Linden St.
Wellesley: Mr. H. R. Mussey, 36 Brook St.
West Medford: Prof. Clarence R. Skinner, 23 Woodsedge Road; Mrs. C. R. Skinner, 23 Woodsedge Road.
West Yarmouth: Joshua F. Crowell; Florence J. Crowell.

MINNESOTA—
Brown Valley: Mrs. S. R. Patterson.
Excelsior: Mrs. Margaret T. Olmstead.
Rochester: Rev. Ernest M. W. Smith, 214 Third St.
St. Paul: Sterling Russell, 489 Mystic St.
Sauk Centre: J. A. DuBois.

MISSOURI—
Aurora: Rev. T. C. Walter.

NEBRASKA—
Hebron: Charles R. Jones.
Kenesaw: J. D. Evans; Miss M. Helen Jones.
Lincoln: Miss Laura Harris, 2500 So. 14th St.; Miss Lulu Tracy Sumner, 621 N. 30th St.

NORTH DAKOTA—
Cummings: Edwin L. Bagge.

NEW JERSEY—
Jersey City: Mr. H. C. Murvihill, 25 Bidwell Ave.; Mrs. H. C. Murvihill, 25 Bidwell Ave.
Lyndhurst: Mrs. H. Prange, 204 Court Ave.

NEW YORK—
Batavia: Miss Emily Putnam Tozier.
Brooklyn: Miss Grace Elizabeth Eglinton, 5 Alice Ct.
New York City: William Floyd, 114 E. 31st St.; Mrs. Nellie R. Johnson, New University Ct.; F. T. Landor, 543 West 123d St.; Miss Isabel F. Lewis, 312 W. 109th St.; Miss Adelaide G. Olney, 227 W. 121st St.; Mrs. Lydia N. Stjeanberg, 236 E. 33rd St.; Rev. J. T. Sunderland, 423 W. 120th St.; Rev. Anna Garlin Spencer, 158 W. 81st St.

PENNSYLVANIA—
California: Mrs. J. F. Colvin; William E. Colvin.
Cambridge Springs: Miss Martha A. Root.
Philadelphia: Mrs. J. T. Rorer, 333 North 34th St.
Salina: F. W. Maguire.
West Brownsville: Mrs. Jane Elliott.

WEST VIRGINIA—
Wheeling: Miss Florence Hoge, 19 Hamilton Ave.

WISCONSIN—
Madison: Chester C. Platt, 1936 Commonwealth Ave.
Oconto: C. W. Stoelting, M. D.
Sauk City: Auguste Lueders.
Watertown: Mrs. Clare Kuenzi.

WYOMING—
Casper: Miss Ida S. Newell, 356 So. Kimball St.

Foreign

CANADA—
Ontario: W. A. Coutts, Heyden, via S. S. Marie.

HAWAII—
Koloa Kauai: Rev. Royal G. Hall.

SWITZERLAND—
Zurich: Dr. Mary G. Schroeder, Kurnacht.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

NEWS FROM HUNGARY.

[There come to us from Hungary these clippings from Hungarian newspapers about the work of our associate, Fred Hankinson, of London. Mr. Hankinson's service with the relief unit at Budapest has been one of noblest efficiency and devotion. He promises on his return to England in May, to report in UNITY his experiences and observations.—EDITORS.]

(1)
WIVES LEFT THEIR HUSBANDS

A Visit to the Russian Wives of Hungarian War Prisoners.

. . . A gloomy square building, dirty walls, many dull windows. The heavy uncouth prison-gate stares with a tired gaze on the Jászberényi ut . . .

. . . Countess Martha Bethlen is the patron of this home. During the war she supported Russian prisoners with great zeal, now besides many other functions she protects their forlorn daughters. She herself conducted me through the institution.

The story of these wives is a common everyday story. One scarcely differs from the others. A brown sad woman speaks: "I lived with my husband for two years. He said he is a man of means having house and estate in Hungary; he offered me to come with him. At home it came out that he possessed nothing. Then he left me and did not want to hear of me. I came to the street, then to hospital where my two babies were born. Misery has taken away one. I lingered about on the street, for some time later they put me in the workhouse in Kecskemét. From there I was taken thither . . ."

. . . In the talk of all of them there is a touch of subjection to fate. Some are cursing aloud, some submit themselves softly and none of them knows what is to come . . .

Countess Bethlen told us the following:

The relief missions also help these unfortunate creatures. Mr. Hankinson, the head of the English Relief Mission, has helped them a great deal. On occasions he clothed them and he also provided for the nutrition of expectant mothers and of infants as well as of small children. Mr. Malama, president of the Russian Red Cross, did a great deal for them too. But here is all help hopeless and in vain. The foreign mission and Hungarian Institutions cannot well provide for their own paupers. But there is no need for such help either. These unfortunate creatures will do honest work. We taught them to sew. Captain Pedlow presented them with a sewing machine, Mr. Hankinson gave them stuff to work with. Last month they earned 18,000 Crowns. They cannot leave home, seeing their state, but here they undertake work willingly. They need nothing but opportunity. I readily offered them my services in this way, to wit: to ask for work of the public. Work and nothing else. Anybody wanting to get a commission should apply to the editor 5-8 p. m. We will forward his address and Lieut. Ilje will readily go anywhere to receive orders.

For, I think in this we all agree, that it is our duty to help at least to this extent, those who were deceived by Hungarians, by our compatriots.—*From the Budapest "News," February* 19, 1922.

(2)
THE POLITICAL CRIMINALS AND MR. HANKINSON

In these columns we never extol single persons even if they deserve it, but we cannot pass by a respectable fact of human solidarity. We are speaking of Mr. Hankinson, the head of the English Relief Mission whose name is well known to all who have taken an interest these last years in the welfare of workmen. He never asked what was the religion, social position or political creed of people in distress. He helped the families of the imprisoned as well as the protegees of catholic patronage; the interned prisoners in Zalaegerszeg as well as the prison mission or the orphan asylums. We workmen especially appreciate in him the absolute lack of prejudice in a regime of darkest reaction and the daring with which he protected the suffering families of men imprisoned or interned in consequence of naught but the malice and personal hatred of their neighbours. He hastened to help any institution for protection of workmen, which applied to him, with willingness. He suppljed the relief committee of Working Women, the union of Children's Friends, the relief action for unemployment, the relief committee of Private employees and other trades-unions with milk, cocoa, fat, soap, clothes. A few days ago when the third transport of political exchange-prisoners to Russia had been recalled on account of the railway strike in Germany, their families, women and children, were sent back as well and they were placed for some days in wagons at the West-station in Budapest. Mr. Hankinson went personally to these unfortunate creatures, he provided them with food, for some days giving to each a 5 Kilo parcel as a gift, containing some flannel and extra provisions. He consoled them with affectionate words emphasizing that he is not interested in politics, to him it is the same to whatever class the individual wanting his help belongs. There is only one important point for him, that none of them shall leave their country with bitterness in their heart but with the feeling of a friend extending his hand towards them. The horny palm of Hungarian workmen comes to shake this hand.—*From the Budapest "People's Voice," February* 19, 1922.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF DAVID STARR JORDAN

THE DAYS OF A MAN

Being Memories of a Naturalist, Teacher, and Minor Prophet of Democracy

THIS autobiography is one that few readers of historical books can afford to be without and one that carries a special appeal to all men of science.

VOLUME ONE, 1851-1899
Deals with the author's early life and career, including accounts of his student days at Cornell, his extensive biological research, Agassiz's great school at Penikese, and the founding of Stanford University.

VOLUME TWO, 1900-1921
Brings the account to date and gives intimate glimpses of prominent men and affairs of the present time. This volume contains much important information concerning matters of current historical interest.

Large 8vo. 750 pages each

Ready for distribution April, 1922

A limited autographed edition also issued

World Book Company
Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York
2126 Prairie Avenue, Chicago

WANTED—"Private auto party of four, would like an additional companion, lady or gentleman, who could assist in driving, for trans-continental trip, commencing June 1. Address, Box 83, Pompton Plains, N. J."

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Every Reader of UNITY Should Read This Book!

NEW CHURCHES FOR OLD

— By —

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

THIS book breaks new ground in the field of religious discussion. Facing the alarming facts of declining church attendance, failing ministerial supply, and loss of ecclesiastical influence and prestige, the author is not satisfied to appeal to people to stand by the existing churches, to liberalize old theologies, etc., but calls for a wholly new statement of religion which shall work itself out into a new form of church organization. In place of the old churches based on sectarian theological beliefs, he pleads for new churches based on democratic social idealism. These churches, which he calls Community Churches, would substitute for loyalty to the single denomination, loyalty to the social group; for a private group of worshippers held together by common theological ideas, the public group of citizens held together by common social interests; for restrictions of creed and ritual, the free spirit; for the individual as an object of salvation, the social group; for Christianity as a religion of special revelation, the idea of universal religion.

Order of the Publisher, **DODD, MEAD & CO.**

Fourth Ave. & 30th St., New York City; or of any bookseller. 341 Pages. $2.00 Per Copy.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:

28 E. Jackson Blvd.

CHICAGO

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street

Phone Douglas 244

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 0231

ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:

3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.